UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,426	07/13/2004	Javier Francisco Aprea	NL 020026	7432
24737 7590 02/04/2010 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			EXAMINER	
			SAINT CYR, LEONARD	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/04/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/501,426	APREA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	LEONARD SAINT CYR	2626
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr tute, cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. The timely filed Tom the mailing date of this communication. The property of the communication of the communication.
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16	his action is non-final. wance except for formal matters,	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the applicati 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	drawn from consideration.	
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on <u>06/12/09</u> is/are: a) ☐ Applicant may not request that any objection to t Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Burn * See the attached detailed Office action for a light	ents have been received. ents have been received in Applic riority documents have been rece eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ived in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summ. Paper No(s)/Mai 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/16/09 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/16/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the claims have been amended, as appropriate, to show transformation or reduction of subject matter to different state of thing, and thus now renders the same as being directed to statutory subject matter (Amendment, pages 6, and 7).

The examiner disagrees, and points out that encoding and outputting audio data do not consider as transformation or reduction of subject matter to different state of thing, since those steps can be interpreted as manipulation of numbers, representing video/audio information.

Application/Control Number: 10/501,426 Page 3

Art Unit: 2626

3. Applicant's arguments, see pages 9, and 10, filed 11/16/09, with respect to claims 1 - 16 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The art rejection of claims 1 - 16 has been withdrawn.

4. Applicants argues that Fielder et al., do not teach that each respective audio frame index has a structure that includes a number pf blocks in a head overlap; a number of blocks in a tail overlap; and a number of blocks in between the head overlap and the tail overlap to a total number of blocks in the audio frame k minus the quantity of the sum of the head overlap plus the tail overlap, further wherein the head overlap comprises a length of only overlap O or overlap O+1 long, which enables each audio frame to be tagged via a 1-bit tag to indicate its size and differentiate between short and long audio frames, and wherein each block of the audio frame is tagged via 1-bit tag to indicate its redundancy so as to differentiate redundant and non-redundant blocks of the respective frame (Amendment, pages 9, and 10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

- 5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:
- 6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 – 16 define non-statutory processes because they merely manipulate an abstract idea (mathematical algorithm). The claimed process, a series of steps to be

Art Unit: 2626

performed on a computer, simply manipulates an abstract idea; does not have any post or pre computer process activity.

In the instant application, the disclosure is directed to any and every structure for carrying out the claimed functions, and not solely to specific structure.

Claims 1 – 16 reviewed in light of the specification, simply recite an abstract idea for encoding audio using a stream that carries audio and video data.

As can be seen by claims 1 – 16, these claims recite an abstract idea by setting forth the step of "providing a mean effective audio frame length F that equals a video frame length 1/Fv over an integral number M video frames, varying lengths F of the audio frames in a defined sequence of frame lengths". These steps are abstract ideas.

Reviewing each claim as whole fails to show the transformation or reduction of subject matter to a different state of thing. Providing a mean effective audio frame length F that equals a video frame length 1/Fv over an integral number M video frames, is merely an abstract idea to encode audio data, not a different state or thing.

It is readily apparent that when claims 1 - 16 are each taken as a whole, the claims are directed to the preemption of an abstract idea, and thus are non-statutory.

Claims 1 - 16 are rejected under 35 USC 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. While the claims recite a series of steps to be performed, a statutory process under 35 USC 101 must be tied to another statutory category (such as a manufacture or a machine) or transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or

Art Unit: 2626

thing. The steps in those claims can be performed manually without the use of a particular machine. Those claims could be done in a piece of paper, wherein digital signal processing (DSP) theory implemented in software codes, can be used to derive the effective audio frame length by varying lengths F of the audio input frame data; since the audio encoder is described in the specification, page 4, lines 12, and 13 as "an audio encoder (that may be implemented for example as a software component)". Thus, claims **1 - 16** do not define a statutory process.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEONARD SAINT CYR whose telephone number is (571) 272-4247. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/501,426 Page 6

Art Unit: 2626

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or (571) 272-1000.

LS

01/28/10

/Leonard Saint-Cyr/

Examiner, Art Unit 2626